



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,497	09/22/2003	Takashi Shigemura	1259-0237P	6845
2292	7590	01/04/2007	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			HAUGLAND, SCOTT J	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			3654	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/04/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,497	SHIGEMURA, TAKASHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Haugland	3654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9,11,12,15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9,11,12,15 and 16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 9/11/06 and 10/6/06 have been entered.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 8, it appears that "of" should be --over--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas (U.S. Pat. No. 5,553,806) in view of Harkins (U.S. Pat. No. 2,353,462).

Lucas discloses a method of winding a web comprising winding the web into a roll and pressing a rotatable lay-on roll 12, 14, 15 against a peripheral surface of the roll. The lay-on roll includes a surface material formed in a cylindrical shape and including rubber having an effective Shore A hardness of 30-55 or 40-65 (abstract; col. 6, lines 20-26).

Lucas does not disclose that the lay-on roll has a surface material that includes rubber having the claimed volume resistivity.

Harkins teaches providing a material handling roller with an electrically conductive rubber cover having an electrical resistivity of 20,000 Ω cm (p. 3, col. 1, lines 15-21) to prevent build up of static charge on the roller and handled material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the lay-on roller of Lucas with a surface material having an electrical resistivity of 20,000 Ω cm as taught by Harkins to prevent build up of static charge on the roller and the paper web.

Lucas discloses winding a paper web which is seen to be a polymer film as recited in claim 1 since paper comprises polymers. In addition, it would have been obvious to use the winding method of Lucas as modified for winding a continuous polymer film of another type (such as recited in claim 13) and to wind polymer webs having the claimed thicknesses (claims 8, 9) and width (claim 15) since the winder of

Lucas would obviously have been capable of winding a wide range of web materials including ones having the claimed characteristics.

It would have been obvious to use a material with high resistance to ozone to prolong its useful life.

With regard to claims 7, 11, and 16, the selection of winding speed, pressing force, and material length to wind would have been a matter of obvious engineering choice since it would have been well within the level of skill of an ordinary artisan to select the appropriate values of these parameters for the particular web being wound.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas in view of Harkins as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Perrigo (U.S. Pat. No. 5,035,373).

Lucas does not disclose decreasing the pressing force of the lay-on roll on the film roll according to an increase in the radius of the film roll.

Perrigo teaches decreasing the pressing force of a lay-on roll on a web roll with increasing web roll radius (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to decrease the pressing force of the lay-on roll of Lucas as the radius of the web roll increases as taught by Perrigo to create a wound roll of the desired hardness. The particular pressing force to apply would have been a matter of obvious engineering choice depending on the material, roll size, width, and other factors which are known to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/06 and 10/6/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Lucas does not disclose a lay-on roll having a flat peripheral surface. However, the rollers 12, 14, 15 of Lucas have the claimed cylindrical shape.

Applicant argues that Harkins is not properly combined with Lucas since the hardness of rubber of the roller covers 13, 14 is different from that of Lucas. However, roller surface hardness and electrical resistivity are independent features with independent effects. The selection of material resistivity would be dependent on the desire to prevent build up of static electric charge, while selection of hardness a roller surface would depend on the forces and pressure to be applied by the roller and the material to which it is to be applied. Harkins teaches how to prevent static build up, which is applicable to the Lucas apparatus and a wide range of material handling apparatus, but does not suggest that there is any problem with the hardness of the material of the rollers in Lucas when the rollers are used for the particular purpose disclosed by Lucas.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Haugland whose telephone number is (571) 272-6945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 10:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki can be reached on (571) 272-6951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

[Signature]
SJM
12/21/06

William A. Rivera

WILLIAM A. RIVERA
PRIMARY EXAMINER